

**REMARKS**

**I. Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-6, 8-16, and 18-20 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 1, 4, and 14 have been amended to more clearly delineate the recited elements. Claims 8 and 18 have been amended to correct dependency. Without prejudice or disclaimer, claims 7 and 17 have been cancelled.

Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

**II. Specification**

The specification has been amended to correct a translation error.

**III. Claim Objections**

**A. Claim 4**

The Examiner objects to claim 4 because, according to the Examiner, "the relationship between the polymer and monomer delineated therein is not precisely lineated." Office Action at 2. Applicants respectfully disagree. However, in an effort to advance prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 4. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection is now moot and should be withdrawn.

**B. Claims 9 and 19**

The Examiner objects to claims 9 and 19. Office Action at 2 According to the Examiner, the claims state that “the vinyl radical ‘contains’ styrene when, in fact, styrene *is* the monomer having a vinyl radical.” *Id.* (emphasis in original).

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner. Claims 9 and 19 clearly state, in relevant part, “the **monomer** having the vinyl radical contains styrene.” Claims 9 and 19 as-filed (emphasis added). Thus, one of skill in the art reading claims 9 and 19 would understand that it is the monomer having the vinyl radical which contains styrene, and not the vinyl radical containing styrene. Accordingly, Applicants submit that this objection is in error and respectfully request its withdrawal.

**IV. Claim Rejections**

**A. Rejection of claims 1-3 and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

The Examiner rejects claims 1-3 and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly “being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.” Office Action at 2. Specifically, the Examiner contends that both “claims 1 and 11 require the presence of a trialkylsilyl moiety but it is not clear given the wording employed as to whether said moieties are to be found at the ends of the backbone, or the ends of the grafted chains, or either, or both.” *Id.*

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner. However, without prejudice or disclaimer, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 11 to further clarify that the

trialkylsilyl moiety is "at the end of the grafted chain." See claims 1 and 11 as amended. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection is moot, and Applicants respectfully request its withdrawal.

**B. Rejection of claims 4-6, 9-10, 14-16, and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

The Examiner rejects claims 4-6, 9-10, 14-16, and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as "being anticipated by Arimura, JP 2000-212305 A." Office Action at 3. In particular, the Examiner asserts that "Arimura discloses the preparation of ion-exchange membranes comprising some combination of the repeat units outlined in the formulat on page 1 of the document." *Id.*

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection. However, without prejudice or disclaimer, Applicants have amended claims 4 and 14, rendering the Examiner's previous rejection moot. Thus, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this rejection.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference could be useful in resolving any of the outstanding issues, he is respectfully urged to contact Applicants' undersigned counsel at 202-408-4368.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this paper and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: April 26, 2005

By: Deborah M. Herzfeld  
Deborah M. Herzfeld  
(formerly Deborah M. Sharfman)  
Reg. No. 52,211